



chris kwan <ecorpnu@gmail.com>

Re: 09/827788 - Clarification

Haq, Naeem <Naeem.Haq@uspto.gov>

To: chris kwan <chris@ecorpnu.com>

Wed, Dec 27, 2006 at 5:48 AM

Cc: "Smith, Jeffrey A. (AU3625)" <Jeff.Smith4@uspto.gov>

Dear Khai Kwan:

I reviewed your application, and a corrected Office Action will be forthcoming. I will also reset the time when the new action is sent. No action is required on your part.

Please note that Office policy does not allow us to prosecute an application via e-mail. All correspondence must be done in writing. Feel free to call me at 571-272-6758 if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Naeem Haq, Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625

-----Original Message-----

From: chris kwan [mailto:chris@ecorpnu.com]

Sent: Saturday, December 23, 2006 5:15 AM

To: Smith, Jeffrey S. (AU2625)

Cc: Haq, Naeem

Subject: Re: 09/827788 - Clarification

Khai Kwan
Peti Surat 1178
Sandakan 90713
Sabah
MalaysiaMr Jeffrey Smith
SPE, USPTO

CC Naeem Haq

Dear Sir,

I refer to the Action Letter mailed Dec 19 by Mr Naeem Haq for above application.

I am concern as the action letter appears to be incomplete as the examiner stop after dealing 112 rejection (see page 3 and 4) and fail to apply either 102 or 103 etc (ie patentability). Please refer to MPEP 2163 and in particular Section "III. COMPLETE PATENTABILITY DETERMINATION UNDER ALL STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS AND CLEARLY COMMUNICATE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND THEIR BASES"

Secondly, I notice that at page 2 of said action letter, in the first para, it says "...amendment filed on August 2, 2006..." while in the next paragraph it reads "The amendment filed on February 25, 2006..." I am

concerned again as this appears to be a mismatch. There is NO amendment filed on Feb 25 ONLY RCE if this is what it is referring to ? I appreciate if you could look into this matter soonest.

Happy Christmas and New Year

Yours Truly,

Khai Kwan
